

REMARKS

In the Action mailed September 21st, 2007, the Examiner rejected all pending claims 1-16. In reply, Applicant has amended claims 1, 7-8, 11, and 15. This includes claims 1, 8 and 11 which are independent claims. Applicant request consideration of the claims as amended in view of the following remarks.

Independent claim 1 is being amended to recite that a computer system has been provided with code configured for generating at least one of a plurality of user messages at a certain time. The amendment is supported in present disclosure, which is directed to a number of examples of user messages that include error messages, system messages, and other preexisting announcements, as opposed to emails, which is not an example of a user message according to the present claims. For example, the specification describes that:

The last message in the panel 500 has number 419 and has the term 'Technical' listed in the result column 530. The message text—'Error F125'—is technically accurate but may be of little value to a typical end user because it presumes that the user knows the significance of this error code. This type of message may be among those that are created in a development phase and are not intended for the final version of the system. Accordingly, the automated message analysis provides that such messages can be identified

Specification page 8, lines 24-29. In addition, FIGs. 2, 3, and 5 show example representations of some of the plurality of user messages generated by the computer system provided with code configured to generate the user messages. Claims 8 and 11 are similarly amended.

Generally, the expression "any ..." in the claims is replaced with "at least one ...". This amendment is supported by the original claims and by the disclosure as a whole.

No new matter is being added.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C § 103

The Examiner rejected pending claims 1, 8, and 11 under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rothwell et al. (U.S. Patent 6,769,016) in view of Kirsch et al. (U.S. Patent 6,772,196). The Examiner rejected pending claims 2-3 and 12-13 under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Rothwell et al., Kirsch et al., and in further view of Fishkin (U.S. Patent 6,460,074). The Examiner rejected pending claims 4, 10, and 14 under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rothwell et al., Kirsch et al., and in further view of Daniell (U.S. Patent Application 2005/0097174). The Examiner rejected pending claim 5 under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rothwell et al., Kirsch et al., and in further view of Basson et al. (U.S. Patent Application 2003/0131057). The Examiner rejected pending claim 6 under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rothwell et al., Kirsch et al., and in further view of Bobo (U.S. Patent 5,870,549). The Examiner rejected pending claims 7 and 15 under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rothwell et al., Kirsch et al., and in further view of Kamiya et al. (U.S. Patent 5,923,845). The Examiner rejected pending claim 9 under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rothwell et al., Kirsch et al., and in further view of Aronson (U.S. Patent 6,654,787). The Examiner rejected pending claim 16 under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rothwell et al., Kirsch et al., and in further view of Drexler (U.S. Patent Application 2002/0046248). Applicant submit that claims 1-16 as amended are patentable over the prior art of record.

Applicant submits that the Examiner's interpretation of "user message" as an email is not supported by the present disclosure. For example, the background section of the present disclosure states that:

Most software applications include messages that can be presented to a user at certain times. User messages are often in form of a dialog box displayed on a computer screen to inform the user of something or to elicit input or information from the user. However, a particular system may include some user messages that are not very helpful to the user

and

There exists coverage analyzers for software code that may track which portion(s) of the code the system actually executes. However, such analyzers do not track which message(s) the code generates or relevant information about the generated messages

Specification page 1, lines 10-13 and page 1, lines 22-24, respectively. In addition, user messages are also described in the specification examples, for example as mentioned above. In fact: none of the messages shown in the present figures are emails; none of the examples

described in the disclosure involve emails; emails are not even mentioned anywhere in the disclosure. Accordingly, it appears the claims were not interpreted in light of the specification. Applicant submits that although the content included in the claimed user message could relate to an email (e.g., "Click OK to send the mail"), the claim element does not encompass processing/distributing the email per se.

However, to further avoid incorrect interpretation of user messages and to advance prosecution, Applicant has further specified in the independent claims that the computer system is provided with code configured for generating at least one of the plurality of user messages at certain times. This amendment addresses the incorrect interpretation because computer systems, as described in the specification, are not provided with code for generating email messages to users.

Applicant's claim 1 is directed to a method that includes accessing a message log comprising information about a plurality of user messages that have been presented in a computer system during a period of time, where the computer system has been provided with code configured for generating at least one of a plurality of user messages at a certain time. Applicant submits that no reference of record discloses or suggests such use of "a message log" for user messages that "have been presented".

The Rothwell reference describes a system, method and computer product for detecting an unwanted email message. For example, "The e-mail passes through a gateway 108 which analyzes the messages to determine whether they are SPAM prior to allowing the message to pass to the local users" column 3, lines 29-31. Accordingly, the processing is not done on a message that the system is provided with code to generate, and the processing is not performed after the e-mail is presented.

The Kirsch reference describes methods for filtering out undesirable email messages sent to a user email address including using a data store for storing signatures corresponding to a subset of undesirable email messages. For example, "As illustrated in FIG. 1, preferred embodiments of the present invention, such as the system 10, utilize a server system 12 to collect and identify UEM [undesired email] through the generation of signature record sets and any number of client systems 14, 14' that, based on the signature record sets, identify and filter-out the corresponding UEM received at their local sites" column 5, lines 13-19. Accordingly, the

processing is not done on a user message that the system is provided with code to generate, and the processing is not performed after the UEM is presented.

The Fishkin reference describes a system for generating an email with a message creation interface including a reconsideration prompt to extract one or more information elements from the email message and present them to the user in a display area. For example, "Referring to FIG. 2, the prompting extension 24 can present a reconsideration prompting dialog 30 to the user. The extension preferably presents the dialog to the user once he or she has indicated that he or she has finished preparing a message. For example, the prompting dialog can intercept the mail utility's 'send' command and present the dialog before the mail utility can actually send the message" column 7, lines 20-36. Accordingly, the processing is not done on a user message that the system is provided with code to generate.

The Daniell reference describes a system and methods for removing an undesired email message. For example, "FIG. 6 is a diagram showing one embodiment 610 of a user interface for adding senders to, and removing senders from the 'block list.' To add a sender, the user may enter a complete email address or domain name into the input box 615 and select the add select button 620. Accordingly, the entered name will be added to the list of email addresses and domain names that make up the 'block list' 630. Further, a user may remove an email address or domain name that is on the block list 630 by selecting the address/name (e.g., by highlighting the address/name) and selecting the remove button 640" page 3, paragraph 38. Accordingly, the processing is not done on a user message that the system is provided with code to generate.

The Basson reference describes a system and methods for transmitting an email message to multiple recipients where the message differs in parts or portions for certain recipients corresponding to markers entered into the email message. For example, "In FIG. 4, user 400 (sender) is preparing a text, in the text production module 402 (keyboard, speech recognition, or handwriting recognition). The user 400 also utilizes an editor with markers 401 that allows a user to flag/note portions of the text that are intended to be read by different recipients. Module 403 allows the user to preview on their own display how the different users will see the document on their computers. Module 404 represents the display with different copies of the same text, how they would be seen by different users—for example, 405, 406, and 407 represent

how the document will be seen different by different users” page 2, paragraph 24. Accordingly, the processing is not done on a user message that the system is provided with code to generate.

The Bobo reference describes a message storage and deliver system (MSDS) and method that stores phone messages in a database and can generate hyper-text markup language (HTML) web pages to deliver the stored messages. For example, “Moreover, the MSDS 10 has been described as having the central processor 3 for handling incoming calls and the Internet Server 10 for interfacing with the Internet 30” column 30 lines 57-59 and “As a further example, the MSDS 10 encompasses the use of ‘dynamic HTML.’ ‘Dynamic HTML’ is a term that has been used to describe the combination of HTML, style sheets, and scripts that allows documents to be animated. The Document Object Model (DOM) is a platform-neutral and language neutral interface allowing dynamic access and updating of content, structure, and style of documents. The MSDS 10 may therefore include the use of the DOM and dynamic HTML to deliver dynamic content to the computer 32 through the Internet 30” column 21, lines 41-53. Accordingly, the processing is not done on a user message that the system is provided with code to generate.

The Kamiya reference describes a system including electronic information collectors that can gather and store information hierarchically in one or more folders corresponding to one or more addresses. For example, “A key component of the present invention is the electronic information collector, hereinafter called collector. Each collector has a distinct address usually in the form of a uniform resource locator (URL). A collector holds a collection of electronic information. The information in a collector can be, for example, documents or articles, such as text files, sound files, graphics files, or video files, links to other collectors, links to other objects such as web pages, links to users, or other collectors. A user can have as many collectors as the user wishes. Typically the user's collectors will be arranged hierarchically with a single root collector. Within a collector a user can create objects such as documents, articles, links, and other collectors” column 6, lines 53-65. Accordingly, the processing is not done on a user message that the system is provided with code to generate, and the processing is not performed after such a message is presented.

The Aronson reference describes a server for filtering email messages. For example, “FIG. 2 illustrates one method for solving this problem. Mail server 130 of FIG. 2 includes an e-

mail filter module 220, a plurality of anti-spam rules 210, mailbox 140, and a spam storage area 230. All incoming e-mail initially passes through filter module 220. Filter module 220 applies a set of rules 210 for detecting spam. Spam is then deposited in a spam storage area 230 while legitimate e-mail is sent through to mailbox 140. In an alternative embodiment, spam is initially stored in a mailbox and is subsequently filtered using filter module 220" column 4, lines 35-44. Accordingly, the processing is not done on a user message that the system is provided with code to generate, and the processing is not performed after the incoming e-mail is presented.

The Drexler reference describes methods for importing emails into a database. For example, "In the illustrative example of FIG. 7, the fields are horizontally aligned to shown the correspondence between the email import fields 292 and the database table fields 291. The email import fields 292 are mapped to corresponding database table fields 291, so that, for example, the Operating System database table field has mapped to it "Field 7" of the email import fields 292, which contains the data string 'WINDOWS NT 4.0', a known operating system trademarked, owned, and marketed by the Microsoft Corporation. The other email import fields in box 292 are likewise mapped to the corresponding database table fields shown in box 291" page 5, paragraph 52. Accordingly, the processing is not done on a user message that the system is provided with code to generate

None of the references of record (e.g., Rothwell, Kirsch, Fishkin, Daniell, Basson, Bobo, Kamiya, Aronson, or Drexler) alone or in any combination discloses or renders obvious a method that includes accessing a message log comprising information about a plurality of user messages that have been presented in a computer system during a period of time, where the computer system has been provided with code configured for generating at least one of a plurality of user messages at a certain time.

Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Examiner remove his obviousness rejection of independent claim 1, as well as the obviousness rejections of dependent claims 2-7 which each depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1.

With respect to the other independent claims 8 and 11, each of these claims recites similar language regarding a message log, and user messages that have been presented. For reasons similar to those described previously in connection with claim 1, claims 8 and 11 are

also patentable. As such, Applicant request the Examiner remove his obviousness rejection from these claims as well.

Conclusion

Applicant submits that the claims 1-16 as amended are in condition for allowance, and requests favorable consideration of these claims.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 21, 2007

/J. Richard Soderberg/

J. Richard Soderberg
Reg. No. 43,352

Fish & Richardson P.C.
60 South Sixth Street
Suite 3300
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 335-5070
Facsimile: (612) 288-9696